## 

## NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

Plaintiff,  V.  Defendant.  For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from 1/10 , 2012 to 1/5 , 2012, the Couffice and the Good and the Speedy Trial Act from 1/10 , 2012 to 1/5 , 2012 and finds that the Good and the Speedy Trial Act from 1/10 , 2012 to 1/5 , 2012 and finds that the Good and the Speedy Trial Act from 1/10 , 2012 to 1/5 , 2012 and finds that the Good and the Speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MAD GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE The Continuance Induces I	United States of America,	) Case No. CR 3-12-70243 MAG
Speedy Trial Act from 10 2012 to 15 3, 2012 and finds that the 'Rad's' guistics served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):  Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MACOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUARCE TO THE EAST PROFILE TO THE STORY PROFILE TO THE STATE PROFILE TO		) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
Speedy Trial Act from 10 2012 to 15 3, 2012 and finds that the 'Rad's' guistics served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):  Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MACOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUARCE TO THE EAST PROFILE TO THE STORY PROFILE TO THE STATE PROFILE TO	<b>,</b>	}
Speedy Trial Act from 10 2012 to 15 3, 2012 and finds that the 'Rad's' guistics served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):  Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MACOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUARCE TO THE EAST PROFILE TO THE STORY PROFILE TO THE STATE PROFILE TO		NODELER LARD 2012
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  AND GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE THE ERIFER United States Magistrate Judge  STIPULATED:  LAUREL BERJER United States Magistrate Judge	by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the	2012, the Court was those under the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 1875, S.C. §
defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).  Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MAD GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE TO REPORT OF STIPULATED:  LAUREL BERUER United States Magistrate Judge		be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  MO GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE TO RECEIVE FOR CONTINUANCE STIPULATED:  LAUREL BERUER United States Magistrate Judge	defendants, the nature of the por law, that it is unreasonable to expe	prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact ect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial
counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  M. GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE FOR CO		·
necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).  AND GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE FOR F. R. CRIM P. 5, I  DATED: 4/12/12  LAUREL BERJER  United States Magistrate Judge	counsel's other scheduled case comn	
DATED: 4/12/12  LAUREL BERUER United States Magistrate Judge  STIPULATED:	necessary for effective preparation, ta	
LAUREL BERIJER United States Magistrate Judge STIPULATED:	IT IS SO ORDERED.	CONTINUANCE SOUSER tous P. 5, 1
	DATED: 4/12/12	
M Homovi Mu Dotondout A adiabate Theire J Market Miller	STIPULATED:	Assistant United States Attorney